

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2004. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 6, 7, 10-48, 52-54, 57, 62-67, 75, 85-90, 98, 99, 102 and 104 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 49-50, 55-56, 58-61, 68-74, 76-84, 91-97, 100, 101, 103 and 105 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 6, 52, 57, 75 and 104 are being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

Claims 8, 9 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for not being supported by the specification, and claim 84 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 21-22, 70, 74, 78 and 105 were objected for various informalities and requested corrections thereof. The specification was objected for a typing error on page 21.

As indicated, claims 8, 9, 70, 74, 78, 81 and 105 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the relevant rejection thus become moot. Regarding claims 21-22, the antecedent in claim 17 was amended previously to add “magnitude” to be consistent with the term in claims 21-22. The typing error on page 21 of the specification is being amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding formality rejections is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Allowable Subjected Matter

Claims 11-48, 62-67, 75, 85-90, 98, 99 and 102 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 112 rejections, and claims 6, 7, 10, 52-54 and 57 would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form and overcome any outstanding claim objections.

Claims 6, 52 and 57 are being amended in independent form, whereby their defendant claims also become allowable. As mentioned, the only 112 rejection is against claims 21-22, and that rejection was overcome previously. As all the above-mentioned allowable claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner, they are now in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 82-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) on the grounds of being anticipated by Agee (6,128,276). Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on the grounds of being unpatentable over Hamdy (6,229,998), against claim 3 over Hamdy in view of Gardner et al. (5,260,968), against claims 3, 8-9 over Hamdy in view of Agee, against claims 1-5, 8, 9, 49-50, 55-56, 58-61, 68-74, 76-81, 91-97, 100, 101 and 103 over Otto (6,600,774) in view of Hamdy. The prior art references of Nakamura et al. (6,446,025), Johnson et al. (5,444,451), Hendrix (3,887,923), Engeler et al. (5,168,214), Kolanek (5,815,117), and Rosen (5,625,624) were cited as being pertinent to the present application.

As claims 1-5, 8, 9, 49-50, 55-56, 58-61, 68-74, 76-84, 91-97, 100, 101, 103 and 105 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejections become moot.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the

above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration No. 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

July 12, 2004
SPF/JCM/JT